

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 191, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—236

Allard	Franks (NJ)	Myrick
Archer	Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt
Armedy	Frissa	Neumann
Bachus	Funderburk	Ney
Baker (CA)	Gallegly	Norwood
Baker (LA)	Ganske	Nussle
Ballenger	Gekas	Oxley
Barcia	Gilchrest	Packard
Barr	Gillmor	Parker
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Paxon
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Petri
Barton	Goodling	Pombo
Bass	Goss	Porter
Bateman	Graham	Portman
Bereuter	Greenwood	Pryce
Bevill	Gunderson	Quillen
Billbray	Gutierrez	Quinn
Billirakis	Gutknecht	Radanovich
Bliley	Hancock	Ramstad
Blute	Hansen	Regula
Boehlert	Hastert	Riggs
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Roberts
Bonilla	Hayworth	Rogers
Bono	Hefley	Rohrabacher
Boucher	Heineman	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownback	Herger	Roth
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Roukema
Bunn	Hobson	Royce
Bunning	Hoekstra	Salmon
Burr	Horn	Sanford
Burton	Hostettler	Saxton
Buyer	Houghton	Scarborough
Callahan	Hunter	Schaefer
Calvert	Hutchinson	Schiff
Camp	Hyde	Seastrand
Canady	Inglis	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Istook	Shadegg
Chambliss	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Shuster
Christensen	Jones	Sisisky
Chrysler	Kasich	Skeen
Clinger	Kelly	Skelton
Coble	Kim	Smith (MI)
Coburn	King	Smith (NJ)
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Combest	Klug	Smith (WA)
Cooley	Knollenberg	Solomon
Cox	Kolbe	Souder
Crane	LaHood	Spence
Crapo	Largent	Stearns
Creameans	Latham	Stockman
Cubin	LaTourette	Stump
Cunningham	Laughlin	Stupak
Davis	Lazio	Talent
Deal	Leach	Tate
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Thomas
Dickey	Lightfoot	Thornberry
Doolittle	Linder	Tiahrt
Dornan	Livingston	Torkildsen
Dreier	LoBiondo	Trafficant
Duncan	Longley	Upton
Dunn	Lucas	Vucanovich
Ehlers	Manzullo	Waldholtz
Ehrlich	Martini	Walker
Emerson	McCrery	Walsh
English	McHugh	Wamp
Ensign	McInnis	Watts (OK)
Everett	McIntosh	Weldon (FL)
Ewing	McKeon	Weldon (PA)
Fawell	Metcalf	Weller
Fields (TX)	Meyers	White
Flanagan	Mica	Whitfield
Foley	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Forbes	Molinari	Wolf
Ford	Montgomery	Young (AK)
Fowler	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Fox	Morella	Zeliff
Franks (CT)	Myers	

NOES—191

Abercrombie	Bonior	Clay
Ackerman	Borski	Clayton
Andrews	Brewster	Clement
Baesler	Browder	Clyburn
Baldacci	Brown (CA)	Coleman
Barrett (WI)	Brown (FL)	Collins (IL)
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Collins (MI)
Beilenson	Bryant (TX)	Condit
Bentsen	Cardin	Conyers
Berman	Castle	Costello
Bishop	Chapman	Coyne

Cramer	Kennelly	Rahall
Danner	Kildee	Rangel
de la Garza	Klecza	Reed
DeFazio	Klink	Reynolds
DeLauro	LaFalce	Richardson
Dellums	Lantos	Rivers
Deutsch	Levin	Roemer
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Rose
Dingell	Lincoln	Roybal-Allard
Dixon	Lipinski	Rush
Doggett	Lofgren	Sabo
Dooley	Lowey	Sanders
Doyle	Luther	Sawyer
Durbin	Maloney	Schroeder
Engel	Manton	Schumer
Eshoo	Markey	Scott
Evans	Martinez	Serrano
Farr	Mascara	Shays
Fattah	Matsui	Skaggs
Fazio	McCarthy	Slaughter
Fields (LA)	McDermott	Spratt
Filner	McHale	Stark
Foglietta	McKinney	Stenholm
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Stokes
Frost	Meehan	Studds
Furse	Meek	Tanner
Gedensson	Menendez	Tauzin
Gephardt	Mfume	Taylor (MS)
Geren	Miller (CA)	Tejeda
Gibbons	Mineta	Thompson
Gonzalez	Minge	Thornton
Gordon	Mink	Thurman
Green	Mollohan	Torres
Hall (OH)	Moran	Torrice
Hall (TX)	Murtha	Towns
Hamilton	Nadler	Tucker
Harman	Neal	Velazquez
Hastings (FL)	Oberstar	Vento
Hayes	Obey	Visclosky
Hefner	Olver	Volkmer
Hilliard	Ortiz	Ward
Hinchey	Orton	Waters
Holden	Owens	Watt (NC)
Hoyer	Pallone	Waxman
Jackson-Lee	Pastor	Williams
Jacobs	Payne (NJ)	Wilson
Johnson (SD)	Payne (VA)	Wise
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Woolsey
Johnston	Peterson (FL)	Wyden
Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)	Wynn
Kaptur	Pickett	Yates
Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy	Zimmer
Kennedy (RI)	Poshary	

NOT VOTING—7

Edwards	Jefferson	Moakley
Flake	McCollum	
Hoke	McDade	

□ 1333

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McDade for, with Mr. Moakley against.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE AGING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 204(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3015(a)), as amended by section 205 of Public Law 102-375, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment to the Federal Council on the Aging for a 3-year term on the part of the House to fill the existing vacancy thereon the following member from private life: Mr. Charles W. Kane of Stuart, FL.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on International Relations; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on Resources; Committee on Science; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and Committee on Agriculture, chaired by that great American and former marine, the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. PAT ROBERTS.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the distinguished gentleman is absolutely correct. The Democrat minority has been consulted on all of these and has no objections.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on both House Resolution 168, which is the corrections day resolution, and House Resolution 169, the legislative branch appropriations rule, the two resolutions just adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may be permitted to include tables and other extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 167 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1817.

□ 1341

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1817) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, June 16, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment through page 2, line 20.

Are there further amendments to this paragraph?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER: On Page 2, line 12, insert "(less \$10,000,000)" before "to remain".

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I am appalled that in this time of ever increasing concern over our burgeoning national debt, the committee has chosen to include in this bill an appropriation of \$10 million as a second down payment on a \$32 million project for a project which is at best of dubious necessity. At worst, it is a \$32 million total boondoggle with no legitimate purpose.

My amendment would cut this wasteful and unnecessary spending and ultimately save the taxpayers \$32 million. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you the twisted tale of this waste of money that is proposed to be taken from the pockets of working Americans.

Once upon a time there was a facility to train Army units at Fort Irwin, CA. But alas this facility had no airport. Personnel had to be trucked 170 miles from the nearest available airfield in Nevada. We can all agree that this was a situation that needed to be remedied.

This House several years ago initiated a study to find a more efficient way to transport trainees. At one point, the Army designated Barstow-Daggett Airfield, currently a Marine Corps logistics facility, as the best available option to upgrade that facility.

The House initiated action to get funds for a \$32 million project to upgrade Barstow-Daggett. But in the meantime, Edwards Air Force Base, 90

miles away from Fort Irwin, became available for this purpose as in downsizing the workload there was reduced and we are informed that the Air Force is amenable to the Army's use of Edwards for this purpose.

George Air Force Base, another local facility 60 miles from Fort Irwin, which has been a closed military facility pursuant to the base closing situation is currently operating as a civilian airport.

Ten million dollars was included in the fiscal year 1995 appropriation to upgrade Barstow-Daggett. It has not been spent. This bill now proposes to appropriate an additional \$10 million for Barstow-Daggett, although construction will not begin until 1997.

In addition, the bill contains language that will instruct the Army to reopen the closed George Air Force Base, reopen a closed base in this time of closing bases, to be used as the interim air base for Fort Irwin until Barstow-Daggett reaches initial operational capability. I will be offering an amendment later to delete that language.

Why should the taxpayers be forced to pay who knows how much to reopen a closed Air Force base when an operating Air Force base, Edwards, can be used instead?

In the meantime the Army has been working on a study which is due to be released in August, 2 months from now, to assess the various options and recommend the proper course of action. Construction at Barstow-Daggett is not due to begin until 1997.

Why cannot we wait until the study is completed in 2 months before deciding which is the best most cost-effective way to proceed? Some will argue that the roads between Fort Irwin and Edwards Air Force Base are unsafe, compared to the roads between George Air Force Base and Fort Irwin. A study by the Army indicates the opposite.

The American Automobile Association, with whom we spoke in Redlands, CA, has provided to us the following information. From Fort Irwin to Edwards Air Force Base is 90 miles, almost entirely freeway driving. No unsafe roads were mentioned.

I have a chart here that illustrates what I am saying. From Fort Irwin to George is 60 miles. Edwards, 90 miles freeway driving; Barstow-Daggett, 35 miles. Is this somewhat shorter distance, 35 miles as against 90, when the 90 miles is freeway driving, an hour and a half, worth \$32 million of taxpayer funds to upgrade Barstow-Daggett to have a 10,000-foot runway, plus the cost of reopening a closed military Air Force base at George for temporary use? I doubt that.

Now, it may be that the Army study due out in August will show that for reasons unknown to us, that is the best way. But why not wait until August to determine that?

This bill contains an appropriation of \$10 million more for Barstow-Daggett, though as I said construction cannot

begin until 1997. So if we do not fund it now it would not delay it. And the committee further instructs the Army to reopen George Air Force Base which has been closed as a part of downsizing.

Mr. Chairman, this is not cut and save. This sounds a lot more like the old tax and spend. What happened to downsizing? What happened to the rhetoric heard in this Chamber while we were slashing programs for children, the needy, veterans, and the elderly? Yes, we have to make tough choices, but our story could have a happy ending if we passed this amendment and saved the taxpayer this money.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that the need to provide an airfield for Fort Irwin has been an issue since the first round of base closure in 1988, when Norton Air Force Base was closed.

The committee has appropriated funds since fiscal year 1994 to bring about the arrangement to locate the air unit at Barstow-Daggett. This will permit 60,000 troops per year to continue to receive state-of-the-art maneuver and training for close combat heavy brigades. The committee's recommendation includes the second phase of funding for a project to meet this requirement.

This is a good solution and deserves the support of this body. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in very, very strong opposition to this proposal by my colleague from New York. I do not know if the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER] has had the opportunity to travel to the National Training Center for the Army. It is without any question the most important and valuable asset that our military has anywhere in the world.

It is the place where we train and retrain our troops in real live war circumstance and prepare them for perhaps the worst they might face out in the battlefield. This is the base about which General Schwarzkoff said,

I commanded the 24th Mechanized Division during seven different rotations at Fort Irwin.

It is the best investment the Army has made in 35 years. The reason we did so well in Desert Storm and Desert Shield is because almost every commander we had over there had some kind of involvement in the NTC.

□ 1345

It is suggested that his amendment saves money by stopping the previously authorized project in mid-stream. This amendment, ladies and gentlemen, wastes money already approved by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the need to have a permanent airhead will not go away. The primary cost factor, distance from the national center, will not change; that is, troops are brought in numbers of 60,000 a year from various bases